EXHIBIT K



	SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	1	ATTORNEY DOCKET N
	07/413,395	09/27/89	GREENSPAN	D	1286
	077413,393		GREENST AN		EXAMINER
- ;		į ·			
	:	i ·		SPEAR,	J
	TIMOTHY J.		30	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	: LAKEWOOD,	LVD., STE. 62 CO 80228	20		6
	1 1/4			152	
	1	}		DATE MAILED:	
Thi	s is a communication from	n the examiner in charge of ye	our application.		12/20/90
со	MMISSIONER OF PATE	NTS AND TRADEMARKS		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
•		.			
	:			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	71
ד גב	his application has bee	en examined 🖟 📖 Resp	consive to communication filed on		This action is made final
\ sho	rtened statutory period	for response to this action	on is set to expire month(om the date of this letter.
Fallun	e to respond within the	period for response; will	cause the application to become aban	doned. 35 U.S.C. 1331	• • •
Dan l	THE FOLLOWING	ATTACHMENT(S) ARE	PART OF THIS ACTION:		
			<u> </u>	•	
1.	Notice of Refere	nces Cited by Examiner,	PTO-892. 2. N	lotice re Patent Drawing	
3.		ted by Applicant PTO-14		lotice of Informal Patent	Application, Form PTO-15
- 5.	Information on I	low to Effect Drawing Ch	anges, PTO-1474. 6,. 🔲 _		
				· .	
Part I	III SUMMARY OF A	CTION	The state of the s		
	. X Claims	- 15			are pending in the appl
	, oianno		3		
: '	Of the at	oove, claims		<u> </u>	are withdrawn from conside
. 2	2 Claims		-,		have been cancelled.
	s. Claims	1			are allowed.
•	J	2 0	0 . 1 ,		
. 4	4. Claims	<u> </u>	and 11	 	are rejected.
	- 1XI	3-4 10	and 12-15	_	ann ablasted to
,	5. 1/21-Claims	- 			are objected to.
1.	6. Claims_		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	are subject to rest	riction or election requireme
	'E ====			· · ·	
	7. L This application	n has been filed with Infor	mal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 wh	ich are acceptable for e	xamination purposes.
	8. Tormal drawing	s are required in respons	se to this Office action		•
,				:	
. 1		or substitute drawings ha			nder 37 C.F.R. 1,84 these o
			i see exclanation or Notice te Patent U	rawing, PTO-948).	
). (1. 1.		table: Inot acceptable	from outilities of the same in a state of		_
)	are 🗆 accep	,	• 1	has (have) be	en 🔲 approved by the
1.	are accep	,	heet(s) of drawings, filed on	has (have) be	en 🔲 approved by the
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	are accept The proposed examiner;	additional or substitute si disapproved by the exam	neet(s) of drawings, filed on liner (see explanation)	, h	
10 (1)	are accept The proposed examiner;	additional or substitute si disapproved by the exam	neet(s) of drawings, filed on liner (see explanation)	has (have) be	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	ere accept The proposed examiner; The proposed	additional or substitute st disapproved by the exam drawing correction; filed	heet(s) of drawings, filed on liner (see explanation). , has been :	approved; 🗖 disappr	oved (see explanation).
) (m)	o. The proposed examiner; The proposed 1. Acknowledgem	additional or substitute st disapproved by the exam drawing correction; filed	heet(s) of drawings, filed on, has been, for priority under U.S.C. 119. The cert	approved; 🗖 disappr	oved (see explanation).
1	are cacepi The proposed examiner; cacepi The proposed cacepi Acknowledgem been filed in	additional or substitute st disapproved by the exam drawing correction; filed_ nent is made of the claim in parent application; seris	heet(s) of drawings, filed on	approved; I disappr	oved (see explanation). received . \(\square\) not been rece
1	are acception and acception are acception. The proposed and acception are acception. Acknowledgem been filed in the application.	additional or substitute st disapproved by the exam drawing correction; filed _ nent is made of the claim in parent application; seria lication apppears to be in	theet(s) of drawings, filed on	approved;	oved (see explanation). received . \(\square\) not been rece
1 1 5 1	are acception and acception are acception. The proposed and acception are acception. Acknowledgem been filed in the application.	additional or substitute st disapproved by the exam drawing correction; filed _ nent is made of the claim in parent application; seria lication apppears to be in	heet(s) of drawings, filed on	approved;	oved (see explanation). received . \(\square\) not been rece
1	are acception and acception are acception. The proposed and acception are acception. Acknowledgem been filed in the application.	additional or substitute st disapproved by the exam drawing correction; filed _ nent is made of the claim in parent application; seria lication apppears to be in	theet(s) of drawings, filed on	approved;	oved (see explanation). received . \(\square\) not been rece
1	are cacept The proposed over	additional or substitute st disapproved by the exam drawing correction; filed _ nent is made of the claim in parent application; seria lication apppears to be in	theet(s) of drawings, filed on	approved;	oved (see explanation). received . \(\square\) not been rece
1 1 5 1	are cacept The proposed over	additional or substitute st disapproved by the exam drawing correction; filed _ nent is made of the claim in parent application; seria lication apppears to be in	theet(s) of drawings, filed on	approved;	oved (see explanation). received . \(\square\) not been rece
1 1 5 1	are cacept The proposed over	additional or substitute st disapproved by the exam drawing correction; filed _ nent is made of the claim in parent application; seria lication apppears to be in	theet(s) of drawings, filed on	approved;	oved (see explanation). received . \(\square\) not been rece
1 1 5 1	are cacept The proposed over	additional or substitute st disapproved by the exam drawing correction; filed _ nent is made of the claim in parent application; seria lication apppears to be in	theet(s) of drawings, filed on	approved; ☐ disappritified copy has ☐ been	oved (see explanation). received . \(\square\) not been rece
1 1 5 1	are cacept The proposed over	additional or substitute st disapproved by the exam drawing correction; filed _ nent is made of the claim in parent application; seria lication apppears to be in	theet(s) of drawings, filed on	approved; ☐ disappritified copy has ☐ been	oved (see explanation). received . \(\square\) not been rece
1	are cacept The proposed over	additional or substitute st disapproved by the exam drawing correction; filed _ nent is made of the claim in parent application; seria lication apppears to be in	theet(s) of drawings, filed on	approved; ☐ disappritified copy has ☐ been	oved (see explanation). received . \(\square\) not been rece

Serial No. 413,395

-2-

Art Unit 152

15.

Applicant starguments filed September 18. 1990 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

16

The following is a quotation of 35 Wes.C. S 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

17.

Claims 1-2, 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. \$ 103 as being unpatentable over Dellutri US 4,620,937.

For claim 1, Dellutri shows compositions wherein 20-90% citric oil is used in combination with stearic acid, oldic acid and aloe yerd. See col. 2, lines 10-13, Claims 1 and 7. Note that the stearic and oldic acids emulsify the composition. Col. 2, lines 33-38. Aloe Vera acts as a moisturizer as in applicants claimed invention. Col. 3, lines 23-28. Dellutri

Serial No. 413,395

Art Unit 152

does not specify orange oil. IT would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to the use orange oil the motivation factor being suggested by Dellutri's use of undistilled citrus oil. Although distilled D-Limonene is preferred, Dellutri teaches that citrus oil, which can be derived from oranges, is suitable for the invention. Col. 2, lines 10-17, thus negating applicants claim of unobviousness.

For claims 2:9 and 11, see Dellutri as explained above.

Claims 5 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Dellutri as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Juliano US 4,014,995.

Juliano teaches the inclusion of substances to maintain a specific pH. Both Juliano and Dellutri teach compositions having teach compositions having a pH of 5.5 Juliano col. 2, lines 3-13, col. 3, lines 5-15. Dellutri col. 3, lines 52-59. To use Juliano's agent in the Dellutri invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. The motivation to do so is suggested by Dellutri's use of emulsifiers in view of Juliano's teaching emulsifiers in maintaining pH.

Claims 1-2, 5-9 and 11 are rejected.

Claims 3-4, 10 and 12-15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten



